

19755. Adulteration of canned salmon. U. S. v. Hood Bay Canning Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100 and costs. (F. & D. No. 27565. I. S. No. 22327.)

This action was based on a shipment of canned salmon, samples of which were found to be putrid, tainted, and stale.

On April 18, 1932, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid an information against the Hood Bay Canning Co., a corporation, Seattle, Wash., alleging shipment by said company, on or about August 27, 1930, in violation of the food and drugs act from Hood Bay, Territory of Alaska, into the State of Washington, of a quantity of canned salmon that was adulterated.

It was alleged in the information that the article was adulterated in that it consisted in part of a decomposed animal substance.

On April 29, 1932, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$100 and costs.

HENRY A. WALLACE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

19756. Adulteration of pecans. U. S. v. 44 Bags of Pecans. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 27591. I. S. No. 45465. S. No. 5625.)

Samples of pecans taken from the shipment involved in this action were found to be decomposed, moldy, wormy, and shriveled.

On or about December 29, 1931, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 44 bags of pecans at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about February 24, 1931, by W. A. Robinson from St. Joseph, La., to Chicago, Ill., and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it consisted in part of a decomposed, filthy, and putrid vegetable substance.

On April 27, 1932, James P. Allen, claimant, having admitted the facts set forth in the libel and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant for sorting under the supervision of this department, in order to separate the good nuts from the bad nuts, upon payment of costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,000, conditioned in part that it should not be sold or disposed of contrary to the provisions of the food and drugs act or the laws of any State, Territory, District, or insular possession.

HENRY A. WALLACE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

19757. Misbranding of canned tomato sauce. U. S. v. Walter M. Field & Co., and Bayside Canning Co. Pleas of guilty. Walter M. Field & Co., fined \$25. Bayside Canning Co., fined \$50. (F. & D. No. 27505. I. S. No. 12381.)

This action was based on the interstate shipment of a quantity of canned tomato sauce, samples of which were found to be short of the declared weight.

On February 15, 1932, the United States attorney for the Northern District of California, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid an information against Walter M. Field & Co., a copartnership, San Francisco, Calif., and the Bayside Canning Co., a corporation, Alviso, Calif., alleging shipment by said defendants, in violation of the food and drugs act as amended, on or about January 13, 1931, from the State of California into the State of Washington, of a quantity of canned tomato sauce that was misbranded. The article was labeled in part; (Can) "Red and White Brand Concentrated Tomato Sauce * * * Contents 8 Oz."

It was alleged in the information that the article was misbranded in that the statement "Contents 8 Oz.," borne on the can label, was false and misleading, and for the further reason that the article was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, since the cans did not contain 8 ounces of the article, but did contain a less amount. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was food in package form and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package, since the statement made was incorrect.

On February 29, 1932, Walter M. Field entered a plea of guilty for the partnership, Walter M. Field & Co., and the court imposed a fine of \$25 against the said partnership. On the same date a plea of guilty was entered on behalf of the defendant corporation, and the court imposed a fine of \$50 against the corporation.

HENRY A. WALLACE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

19758. Adulteration of apples. U. S. v. Henry Thomas. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 27469. I. S. Nos. 12299, 12300.)

Arsenic was found on the apples in the interstate shipment on which this action was based.

On April 2, 1932, the United States attorney for the District of Utah, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid an information against Henry Thomas, Provo, Utah, alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the food and drugs act, on or about March 23, 1931, from the State of Utah into the State of Nevada, of a quantity of apples that were adulterated.

It was alleged in the information that the article was adulterated in that it contained an added poisonous and deleterious ingredient, arsenic, which might have rendered it injurious to health.

On April 8, 1932, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

HENRY A. WALLACE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

19759. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 13 Tubs of Butter. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 27892. I. S. No. 47593. S. No. 5804.)

Samples of butter from the shipment involved in this action having been found to contain less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat, the standard prescribed by Congress, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the matter to the United States attorney for the Southern District of Ohio.

On or about January 19, 1932, the United States attorney filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 13 tubs of butter, remaining in the original packages at Columbus, Ohio, consigned by the Fairmont Creamery Co., on or about December 29, 1931, alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce from Guthrie, Okla., to Columbus, Ohio, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that a product which contained less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat had been substituted for butter, a product which should contain not less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat.

On March 12, 1932, the Fairmont Creamery Co., Columbus, Ohio, having appeared as claimant for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the claimant be permitted to rework the product under the supervision of this department, upon the execution of a bond in the sum of \$350, conditioned that it would not be sold, or otherwise disposed of contrary to the Federal food and drugs act and all other laws; and further conditioned that the claimant pay costs of the proceedings. On April 8, 1932, the conditions of the bond having been complied with, the court ordered that the product be released.

HENRY A. WALLACE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

19760. Adulteration and misbranding of canned shrimp. U. S. v. 150 Cases of Canned Shrimp. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 27895. I. S. Nos. 50439, 50446. S. No. 5939.)

Samples of canned shrimp from the shipment involved in this action were found to be partially decomposed. The article also was falsely branded as to the name of the manufacturer and the State in which produced.

On March 10, 1932, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid, a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 150 cases of canned shrimp, remaining in the original unbroken packages at New Orleans, La., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce, in part on or about February 23 and February 24, 1932, by J. H. Pelham, from Pascagoula, Miss., to New Orleans, La., and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and